DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 194 PS 012 995

AUTHOR Anderson, Elaine A.
TITLE The Politics of Family Day Care: Legislatively What Can Be Done.
PUB DATE Oct 81
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations (Milwaukee, WI, October 16, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Certification; *Child Caregivers; Early Childhood Education; *Family Day Care; *Governance; Program Administration; *Public Policy; Questionnaires; State Surveys; Training
IDENTIFIERS *Connecticut

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire designed to measure a number of topical issues regarding child care providers and child care provision was sent to all licensed family day care home providers in the state of Connecticut. The questionnaire focused on six major areas of investigation: the service provider's history in the area of day care, issues surrounding licensure, training and technical assistance, and providers' interaction with the state and district administration of family day care. Several questions were asked about the children under care and the families making use of it. The final section of the questionnaire focused on the family day care home providers themselves. Of 2,500 eligible participants, 800 were randomly selected for participation. A total of 386 completed questionnaires were returned. Results are discussed, and general policy recommendations in the areas of administration, legislation, and social science research are offered. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220194

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE POLITICS OF FAMILY DAY CARE: LEGISLATIVELY WHAT CAN BE DONE

Elaine A. Anderson, Ph.D.
The University of Maryland
Department of Family & Community Development

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Elaine A. Anderson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 012995

Presented at the National Council on Family Relations Annual Meeting, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 16, 1981.

Special acknowledgment is extended to the Connecticut Legislative Program Review Committee and to Ms. Randy Garber for her input in the development and design of the evaluation.

Within the last five years increasing amounts of attention have been given to the issue of "family policy" (Kamerman & Kahn, 1978; Meyer, 1978; Pardeck, 1979; Reiss & Hoffman, 1979; and Zimmerman, 1976). There has been discussion about family policy issues at the national level during 1980 as well as within different regions of the United States as represented by the White House Conference on Families and the Eastern, Midwest and Western Regional White House Conferences on Families. During the meetings, conference attendees addressed many issues which are relevant to families and their well-being. In addition, each conference developed recommendations which called for government at all levels to promote policy which would assure that programs involve families and reflect their diverse values and choices.

This White House Conference mandate is exemplar of the traditional legislative mandate. That is, the legislative branch of our government should create policy which will effectively help society to regulate its behavior better. In addition, legislative policy will identify social policies of concern to the public and will guide the course of action to be followed in executing the governance of social relationships and the distribution of resources around these policies. Social policy should be continually evolving and changing to meet the articulated needs and evolution of the larger society. Policy formation should represent a systematic and extensive attempt by the legislative branch to monitor and review what is and is

not in the public's best interest not only programmatically but also fiscally. This legislative responsibility is often called legislative oversight.

Legislative oversight is a term which has been used to describe government monitoring and evaluation activities which assess how well an agency, program or policy operates. The following are questions which legislative oversight attempts to address. How do we know whether a law is working or being ignored? How well is a program or policy meeting the needs of the people for whom it was designed? Is an agency fulfilling its purposes and operating efficiently and effectively? These are all questions which might be asked by legislators, organizations, or consumers. By attempting to answer these questions one is conducting legislative oversight.

The review function identified as legislative oversight has been neglected in many states. Not until 1970 did several states begin to address the issue of oversight. Within a decade, virtually all 50 states had some form of oversight. The oldest, or perhaps most publicly visible forms of oversight have been located administratively in budget or fiscal offices, the auditors office, or within specific committees of the legislature. Newer forms of oversight responsibilities have been delegated to regulations review committees; and the most innovative placements for legislative oversight have been given to new independent legislative oversight committees. This newest form of oversight, more than the other forms, has emphasized the fulfill-

ment of program goals. Legislative oversight is important in the ideal sense, because it determines the impact and effectiveness of our laws and social programs.

Through the process of assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of our social policies, advocates for the family may discover that the family as a social variable will become more visible in the development of our public policy. We may never have a national family policy as some proponents would advocate. However, social policy which is relevant to family issues may help to ensure the visibility and viability of the family as an important social system.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the impact of the process of legislative oversight on a particular social program, namely family day care home policy. In particular, the family day care home policy was selected because it was discovered that in Connecticut, where the study was designed, there was no state day care policy. In addition, there was an acknowledgement of the current and escalating need for day care. Those individuals who deliver and provide the family day care home service were identified as a critical factor in the successful implementation of the family day care policy. Therefore, this paper will discuss the family day care home service provider's role in relation to family day care home provision.

THE CURRENT NEED FOR DAY CARE

Child day care service provides parents or guardians who

are working or away from home with care for their children during a part of the day. The use of day care services by parents facilitates a strengthening of the family by allowing parents to pursue their vocations and avocations while also providing their children with competent child care. Currently, the form of child care most often used for all age groups--other than the child remaining in his or her own home--is the family day care home (Office of Assistance for Planning and Evaluation, 1978).

The National Child Care Consumer Study in 1975, based on a national probability sample of more than 4,000 households with at least one child under 14, estimated that 37 percent of the children receive child care out of the home, versus 45 percent who receive family or relative care, and only 16 percent who receive center-based care. Moreover, 76 percent of the respondents said they did not want to change the method of child care they currently used, and indeed, over 90 percent had not changed their method of care during the preceding year. Other researchers (Hill, 1978) have suggested that fewer people may use formalized methods of care, such as a day care center, than reported by the National Child Care Consumer Study. However, seldom do we hear about child care in the family day care home, and we have even less information about how it functions, who runs the service, who uses the service and how the consumers feel about this family program.

The need for day care services is continuing to escalate.

This need differs depending on the age of the child, the income of the family, where the family lives, the family structure and the employment status of the parents. Child care is a concern for increasing numbers of women who are choosing to return to the work force shortly after the birth of their child. Concommitently, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of women entering the labor force. In 1940, only 25 percent of all women worked out of the home, yet by 1979 that number had increased such that over one-half of all women are employed out of the home (Hill, 1977, 1978). Even more startling is the figure that today 70 percent of these women are employed full-time (Authier, 1979). Some researchers speculate that these numbers may be conservative (Hill,1978).

Another indicator which has been used as a determinor of day care need is the number of working women who have preschool children. In March 1979, 45 percent of the mothers with children under the age of six were employed. Sixty-three percent of the mothers who had children between the ages of six and 17 years were working out of the home. Hence, the "latch-key" syndrome--a child coming home to an empty house--is a paramount consideration for parents who need supervisory care for the older child in an afterschool setting. By 1990, in less than 10 years, it is estimated that two out of three mothers will be working out of the home and that one-half of those women will have children under the age of six (Urban Institute, 1980). Therefore, a large number of children currently need day care

services, but an even greater number will need day care assistance in the near future.

In the past, research has investigated the relationship between income or marital status and the need for day care. In general, the lower a family's income, the greater the need for day care services which would enable both parents to work. There likely will be an even greater demand for day care services, regardless of income levels of the families, as more and more families have both parents working outside of the home.

This increased demand for day care services likely will also be exaccerbated by an increase in the prevalence of single parent families. By 1974, (Bronfenbrenner, 1975) one out of six children under 11 years of age lived in a single parent family--this number was almost double the rate of 30 years earlier. Today, 54 percent of the female headed households are in the labor force. Once again these statistics point to a sizeable number of households as well as parents and children who need some form of assistance at least part of the day with child care. Therefore, one can conclusively state that the importance of child care services is recognized and the impact of this family issue must be explored further at the programmatic and legislative levels.

METHODS

Legislative Program Review and Investigations Committee

The following is a brief description of the legislative

committee for which this review was conducted. The Committee was created to conduct performance evaluations of selected state agencies, programs and policies. The goal is to ascertain whether such programs are effective and efficient and serve the legislative purpose or if they should be modified or eliminated. The twelve member committee has equal representation from each party and chamber. The co-chairpersonships also are bi-partisan. The staff for the Committee is hired on a non-partisan basis.

The Unit of Analysis

The family day care home (FDCH) was selected as the unit of analysis for this study. The major reasons for selection of this type of day care were the following: 1) FDCH's are the most frequently used day care service aside from the child remaining in his or her own home; 2) FDCH services are believed to be the most fiscally frugal of all day care alternatives (Robinson, et. al., 1979); and 3) FDCH's are one type of day care service about which we have limited knowledge. In addition, several benefits of the FDCH have been identified. The home usually is within the consumer's neighborhood, it is considered to be less formal and more personalized administratively than other child care services, it usually has more flexible hours and days and involves a smaller group of children often including siblings (Westinghouse/Westat, 1971; Rhodes, 1979).

The Population and Sampling

The population for this study consists of all licensed family day care home providers in the state of Connecticut during February 1980. The requirements for obtaining a state family day care home license at the time of this study were the following. A family day care home is a private family home where not more than four children who are not related to the provider are cared for not less than three nor more than 12 hours during a 24 hour period on a regularly recurring basis. The day care group cannot have more than two children under the age of two.

The provider must be 18 or older; not otherwise employed during their childcaring hours; be able to work with children and parents; and be capable of alert and competent supervision. The home must be accessible to a road passable 12 months a year; be deemed fire safe by the local fire marshall; have sufficient ventilation, heat, and light; and have the water and house paint tested by the state department of health. The family day care home applicant and any other family members who are regularly in the home during the day care hours must have a physical exam; three letters of reference also must be provided.

The population for the present study included 2,500 eligible respondents in the state. A non-probability, purposive sampling technique was used. A listing of all the licensed

family day care home provider's names and addresses was made available by the Department of Human Resources. Eight hundred names, or 32 percent of the population were randomly selected.

Data Collection

The data, collected during March and April of 1980, consisted of in-depth structured questionnaires which focused on the history of care, licensure, training and technical assistance, the children served, and the family day care home service provider themself. A larger project of which this study was a part, consisted of a survey of all local and district offices, the main state department of day care services and the state day care council. The questionnaire used for the present study was developed by the research team involved with the larger study.

A pilot study was conducted during February of 1980. Respondents for the pilot study consisted of 10 persons who either work with and train day care providers or who are professionals in the area of program evaluation. The researchers and respondents discussed the content of each question. The instrument was then modified and improved.

The following procedure was utilized in this research study. After the list of eligible respondents was obtained, a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, a questionnaire, and an addressed stamped envelope were mailed to

possible participants. The questionnaire contained approximately 75 questions. Two weeks after the first mailing, a second questionnaire, reminder and addressed stamped envelope were mailed to those who had not responded. After two more weeks a second follow-up reminder letter again was sent to those who had not returned their questionnaire. Forty one surveys were returned by the U.S. Postal Service. Thus, 386 completed questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 51 percent. Preliminary results were sent to the district offices, the state department involved in the study, the day care council and any other individuals or organizations who had expressed an interest in receiving feed-back concerning the findings of this study.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire developed for this research study was designed to measure a number of topical issues regarding the child care providers and the actual child care provided. The questionnaire consisted of six major areas of investigation. These were the service provider's history in the area of day care, issues surrounding licensure, questions about training and technical assistance, and their interaction with the state and district administration of family day care. Several specific questions were asked about the children and families cared for by the service providers. The final section concerned the family day care home providers themselves (see Appendix A).

RESULTS

The data presented in this study are the preliminary results of the data analysis. These results highlight the issues pertaining to family day care. The first issue identified as important to the area of family day care is the consumer's awareness of the licensing process. Only 63 percent of the Connecticut family day care home providers knew they were required to have a day care license when they first started caring for children. Subsequently, the providers reported they found out about the licensure requirement from neighbors or friends (29 percent), another day care provider (28 percent), someone from the state agency which operates day care (24 percent), or the newspaper (16 percent). Consequently, although the average length of time a caregiver had been providing family day care home services was 47 months, the providers had only been a state licensed family day care home provider for 40 months on the average. This compares with a national average of 52 months (Steinberg & Green, 1979).

Recognizing that many providers do not initially get a state license to provide day care services the providers were asked why they thought some providers decided never to get licensed. Two major factors were of importance--money and privacy. Over 60 percent of the respondents stated issues such as not wanting to list day care income on their taxes, or a license limiting the number of children one can care for,

hence limiting ones income as important reasons. In addition, over 50 percent of the respondents either said that state people coming into the home or telling the family day care home provider what to do seemed also to be a deterrent. Interestingly, only 10 percent thought that nonlicensed family day care home providers believed that a license would increase their costs.

In response to these factors, the licensed family day care home providers were asked what incentives attracted them to obtaining a family day care home license. Whereas 30 percent of the respondents reported receiving workshop training was either very or somewhat important in their decision to become licensed, 60 percent said even the idea of receiving information about issues of health, safety, program planning or activities had been instrumental in their becoming licensed. Forty percent of the respondents said they hoped to be part of an association of other family day care home providers, 53 percent said having trained people review and comment on their work was important, and 60 percent said they believed obtaining a family day care home license would give some importance to their work. Forty-four percent of the respondents reported that help with filling their vacancies had been of importance. Forty-two percent of the respondents did say knowing a family day care home license was legally required had been very important in their decision to become licensed, but an equivalent 40 percent said that issue had not been important in their

decision to become licensed.

Several researchers have reported that family day care home services tend to be more unstable and unreliable than other kinds of child care service (Steinberg and Green, 1979; Saunders and Keister, 1972). In the present study, data suggests that 50 percent of the family day care home respondents did report having been out of the day care business for periods of time, although the average number of months a child remained in their care on a full-day basis was 12 months. Likewise, the most frequent response to why they had discontinued service during those times was that they didn't have enough children to make it worthwhile.

Becoming aware of licensure is important for the family day care home provider, but becoming aware of the issues surrounding licensure and the licensing process also is important. Between 34 and 43 percent of the Connecticut family day care home respondents believed completion of training offered by the state in the areas of nutrition, child development, disciplining children and activity planning was very important even before a license was granted. In addition, 57 percent felt a medical exam for themselves should be completed, 62 percent wanted a lead paint inspection of their home, and 56 percent agreed that reference letters were very important before a license was granted.

Once a licehse is awarded to the family day care home

provider, contact with the state agency does not terminate. Family day care homes are monitored by the state agency to insure adherence to licensing standards. Although Connecticut officially only visited the family day care homes once a year unless a complaint had been filed against the caregiver, we asked the family day care home service providers what they believed should be the frequency with which a licensing representative should visit their home. Most respondents indicate that they would like to have the state visit their homes at least every six months to provide them with feedback or assistance. Surprisingly, the district day care offices in most instances reported they could make six month visits, usually without additional staff, if they had an additional state automobile available for the visits.

Several issues have previously been identified as strengths of the family day care home service. One of those issues is the establishment of a fee schedule. Sixty-seven and 48 percent respectively said they established their fee rate depending on whether or not the parents wanted to pay on an hourly basis or pay on a weekly versus daily basis. In addition, one-half of the providers said they take into consideration whether or not they are providing care for two or more children from the same family. The child's age and the child's family situation were also considered by 37 and 32 percent respectively of the family day care home providers.

To understand further issues concerning family day care

home service provision, service providers were asked a battery of questions about themselves and their backgrounds. On the average, providers of family day care were 37 years of age and had completed 12.4 years of schooling. Three-fourths of the respondents were white, with 20 percent black and 5 percent Hispanic. There was a wide range of income levels from 20 percent who made less that $5,000 for their total yearly family income before taxes to 20 percent who made $15 to $20,000 for the yearly family income and 13 percent who were in the $20 to $25,000 income bracket. About 40 percent each provided family day care home services in an urban or suburban area and 20 percent in a rural setting. Only about 18 percent of the family day care home providers were receiving some form of government assistance themselves such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Social Security Insurance or General Assistance.

POLICY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a list of general policy recommendations which are an outgrowth of this analysis of social policy concerning family day care. The recommendations purposely have been kept general in order to make them more generically applicable across geographic locations and situations. These recommendations have been culled not only from some of the results presented in this paper, but also from the insight and experi-

ences of the legislative committee.

Administrative Recommendations

It is important to find out from the family day care home service providers, the parents,and the community whether or not the state agency responsible for family day care both is efficient and effective. By formalizing goals and objectives (developing policy) one can identify what to work towards and how to manage ones goals. In addition, standardizing operating procedures for an initial licensing period, instituting a license renewal format, developing a mechanism to handle complaints and systematically conducting home monitoring may protect the public by increasing job efficiency and security for the service providers.

The development of a system for disseminating public information about family day care homes both to providers and consumers seems critical. In particular, information about licensing requirements, costs, benefits, training and enforcement should be available. A referral network not only for parents who are seeking family day care, but also for family day care home providers who seek to develop support groups of other family day care home providers must be developed. Finally, it would be helpful to the family day care providers if the current fee rates for special need children and for infants were re-evaluated. Incentives need to be made available for those providers who choose to care for these needy children.

Legislative Recommendations

The level and form of regulation used by the state should be reviewed to ensure that the current system fits the specifications of the level of regulation. Issues such as enforcement and competency must be addressed. Regulations about family day care home capacity limits should be reviewed in light of new federal regulations. In particular, meeting the needs of all ages of children from infancy through school age should be addressed.

The Social Scientists Role in Family Relevant Policy

Social scientists to date have not been actively involved in providing input about family relevant variables to policy-makers. Social scientists need to learn to understand what current statutes and regulations say and address. In turn, social scientists need to formulate more of their questions about statutes and regulation issues.

Researchers should become informed about the history of the state agencies which administer programs or policies related to family variables. Identifying the policy issues underlying a state agency's administrative format could help the researcher to understand why certain issues have been emphasized and why some areas have become problematic.

In addition, the social scientist at the outset of his or her research should identify legislators as well as the

legislative committees which could profitably use evaluation information. Contact could be made to inform these individuals about pertinent research and to obtain information from their perspective. After the research is completed, the social scientist should help legislators to understand and to use the results. Policymakers need to be made aware of how the laws they enact impact both on the people they serve and on those who have to implement the laws. Lawmakers need feed-back on the effectiveness of their legislation. In addition, the administration who implements the programs originated by policymakers could also use feed-back about the effectiveness and efficiency of programs under their purview.

Legislative oversight can be used to determine how effective a legislative decision has been concerning a policy or a program. Sequentially the next stage is to carry this evaluation theme one step further and to relate it in particular to families. Hence, it is important both to evaluate a social program and then to study the impact of a policy decision on the actual families affected by the decision and to evaluate the desirability of these impacts.

In other words, oversight can produce a family impact statement which will describe current or projected effects of specific social programs or policies on all families and on specific types of families. The family can be viewed as a social

system which is impacted by the environment. Different characteristics of the family will have social policy implications. It is important to identify two types of impacts--structure and function. The structure impacts include issues such as what size of family might be most impacted, what stage of the life cycle is affected, and how are different SES, racial and ethnic backgrounds impacted? The function impact actually includes the performance of tasks. How is the provider or economic function affected, what about the childrearing and caregiving function or the resource distribution and coordination task, and finally the family membership function.

Evaluation techniques cannot be a static process, but must be dynamic or iterative. Evaluation results such as those discussed in this paper may affect decision making which may affect future legislation, administrative decisions, and ultimately family conditions. All of these stages of the decision-making process must be reviewed in order to create social policy which is relevant to families.

REFERENCES

Authier, K. Defining the care in child care. Social Work, 1979, 24(6), 500-505.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Is early intervention effective? Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.

Hill, C. R. The child care market: A review of evidence and implications for federal policy. In Policy issues in day care: Summaries of 21 papers. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977.

Hill, C. R. Private demand for child care: Implications for public policy. Evaluation Quarterly, 1978, 2, 523-545.

Kamerman, S. B. & Kahn, A. J. Family policy: Government and families in fourteen countries. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.

Meyer, C. H. Practice and policy: A family focus. Social Casework, 1978, 59(5), 259-265.

Office of Assistance for Planning and Evaluation. The appropriateness of the federal interagency day care requirements (FIDCR): Report on findings and recommendations. Washington D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June, 1978.

Pardeck, J. T. Supporting American families through a national social policy. Family Therapy, 1979, 6(1), 11-20.

Reiss, D., & Hoffman, H. A. The American family: Dying or developing. New York: Plenum Press, 1979.

Rhodes, S. L. Trends in child development research important to day-care policy. Social Services Review, 1979, 53, 285-294.

Robinson, N. M., Robinson, H. B., Darling, M. A., & Holm, G. A world of children. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1979.

Saunders, M., & Keister, M. Family day care: Some observations. Unpublished manuscript, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1972.

Steinberg, L., & Green, C. How parents may mediate the effect of day care. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, San Francisco, 1979.

Unco Inc., National child care consumer study. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

Urban Institute, The subtle revolution: Women at work. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1980.

Westinghouse Learning Corporation & Westat Research, Inc., Day care survey--1970: Summary report and basic analysis. Washington D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1971.

Zimmerman, S. The family and its relevance for social policy. Social Casework, 1976, 5(9), 547-554.

APPENDIX A

DAY CARE PROVIDER QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

We appreciate you taking your time to fill this out. Please answer every question on both sides of every page. Thank you.

---

1. How many years have you been a family day care provider? _____
   WRITE NO. OF YEARS

2. How many years have you been a state-licensed family day care provider?
   _____
   WRITE NO. OF YEARS

3. How many months does the average child remain in your care on a full day basis?
   _____
   WRITE NO. OF MOS.

4. When you first started to care for other people's children, did you know that a state day care license was required to run a family day care home?
   Please Circle YES NO

5. How did you discover that a state day care license is required? You may circle more than one item.

   a. neighbor or friend (who is not a provider)
   b. news media
   c. another day care worker
   d. church or civic group
   e. local school personnel
   f. someone from the Dept. of Health
   g. someone from the Dept. of Human Resources (formerly the Welfare Dept. - DSS)
   h. someone from the Dept. of Children and Youth Services (DCYS)
   i. other state agency (please write in) _____
   j. a private agency (ex. Child and Family Services). Please write in _____
   k. Info Line
   l. other, (please write in) _____

6. How many people of each of the following age groups currently live in your household? Write in number of persons in each group.

   WRITE NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD

   a. adults _____
   b. children age 13 to 18 _____
   c. children age 5 to 12 _____
   d. children less than 5 years old _____

6a. How many people in your household do you care for during the hours you are providing your family day care service?
   _____
   WRITE NUMBER

7. When you first decided to open a family day care home, who did you contact to apply for a day care license? Please WRITE IN name of agency or department _____.

8. For each of the following groups, first tell us how many children you presently care for in each group and second, how many you would like to care for in each group?

	WRITE NUMBER YOU PRESENTLY CARE FOR	WRITE NUMBER YOU WOULD LIKE TO CARE FOR
a. full-day care		
b. part-time care		
c. night-time care		
d. before and/or after school care		
e. infant care		
f. toddler care		
g. care for the mentally retarded		
h. care for physically handicapped		
i. care for emotionally disturbed		

9. Below are listed some reasons why family day care providers get a day care license. Please circle how important EACH item was to you when you first decided to get a day care license.

	Very Imp.	Somewhat Imp.	Not Too Imp.	Not At All Imp.
a. to get help filling my vacancies.....	4	3	2	1
b. to receive state money.....	4	3	2	1
c. to receive workshop training by the state.....	4	3	2	1
d. to receive information from the state on things like health, safety, program planning, and activities.....	4	3	2	1
e. to provide me with an association of day care providers.....	4	3	2	1
f. to give my work importance.....	4	3	2	1
g. to have trained people review and comment on my work.....	4	3	2	1
h. because I thought I had to.....	4	3	2	1
i. other (please specify)_____				

10. Please circle if your community needs MORE, the SAME NUMBER, or FEWER types of FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES. Please answer EACH item.

My community needs:	More	Same Number	Fewer
a. full-day family day care.....	3	2	1
b. part-time family day care.....	3	2	1
c. night-time family day care.....	3	2	1
d. before and/or after school care.....	3	2	1
e. infant family day care.....	3	2	1
f. toddler family day care.....	3	2	1
g. family day care for the mentally retarded.....	3	2	1
h. family day care for the physically handicapped.	3	2	1
i. family day care for the emotionally disturbed..	3	2	1

11. Since you were first licensed as a family day care provider, have there ever been times when you did not provide family day care services? Please circle YES or NO.

YES NO (Go to Q. 12)

11a. IF YES, please tell us which of the following best describes why you stopped your family day care service during those times. You may answer more than one. Please circle answer(s). "I discontinued service because":

a. I didn't have enough children (applicants)
b. I found different employment
c. I needed more income
d. I had difficulty meeting the state requirements
e. I just didn't like the job anymore
f. I needed more time for other interests
g. poor parent cooperation (child not picked up on time, parental neglect, or abuse of child)
h. parents did not pay on time
i. state did not provide payment for AFDC children on time
j. lack of technical assistance from the district office
k. I moved
l. other (please write in) _____.

12. Please tell us how easy or difficult it has been for you to deal with EACH of the following state agencies. Please circle the number under the answer for each item.

	Easy	Not Too Difficult	Difficult	Impossible
a. the staff of your district office.....	4	3	2	1
b. Central Day Care Office (Dept. of Human Resources.....	4	3	2	1
c. Dept. of Children and Youth Services (DCYS).....	4	3	2	1
d. other (please write in)_____				

13. Have you read the state standards for licensed day care? Please circle YES or NO.

YES NO (Go to Q. 14)

13a. IF YES, how clear are the licensing standards? Please circle the number below your answer.

	Very Clear	Somewhat Clear	Not Very Clear	Not At All Clear
The licensing standards are.....	4	3	2	1

14. Some people decide not to license their day care home. Which of the following do you think are the most important reasons why people choose not to license their day care homes. You may circle more than one answer.

a. they don't want state people coming into their home
b. they don't want state people telling them what to do
c. they don't want the state to release their name to parents
d. because a license limits the number of children they can care for
e. because it means extra work for them
f. because a license increases their costs
g. because they would prefer not to list this income on their taxes
h. other (please WRITE IN) _____.

15. How many people do you know of who are currently providing family day care without a license? Please circle the number.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 More than 10

16. How important do you think it is to have each of the following completed before being licensed as a family day care provider? Please answer each item.

	Very Imp.	Somewhat Imp.	Not At All Imp.
a. training by the state in nutrition.....	3	2	1
b. training by the state in child development.....	3	2	1
c. training by the state in disciplining children..	3	2	1
d. training by the state in activities planning....	3	2	1
e. medical examination for you.....	3	2	1
f. medical examination for others in household.....	3	2	1
g. water inspection of my home.....	3	2	1
h. lead paint inspection of my home.....	3	2	1
i. reference letters.....	3	2	1
j. other (please write in) _____			

17. After your application to become a family day care provider was completed (medical exam in, water inspection done, references in, etc.), how long was it before a licensing representative first visited your home? Please circle ONLY ONE answer.

a. less than two weeks
b. between two weeks to one month
c. one month to six weeks
d. more than six weeks
e. the licensing representative never visited my home

18. Which items did the licensing representative check in your home when he or she first inspected your home. You may circle MORE THAN ONE item.

a. Poisons out of children's reach
b. Electrical appliances in good repair
c. Fire extinguisher available
d. Safety of toys
e. Posted emergency telephone numbers
f. Meal plans
g. Your rules for children
h. Your plans for children's activities
i. None of these

19. In your opinion, what is the minimum number of times a year a licensing representative should visit a family day care home to check licensing standards? Please WRITE IN NUMBER.

_____
WRITE IN NO. OF TIMES

20. Day care services for children are often funded by a number of sources. Please WRITE the number of children receiving your family day care through EACH of the following funding sources. In the second column, please write how much income you receive from each source per week.

INCOME SOURCE	WRITE IN NUMBER OF CHILDREN	WRITE IN TOTAL INCOME PER WEEK
a. AFDC/WIN		
b. Other kind of government money		
c. Parent or guardian's income		
d. I don't know		

21. Please check how often you have received assistance from your district office for EACH of the following.

I have received assistance for:	Very Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
a. activities planning.....	4	3	2	1
b. meal planning.....	4	3	2	1
c. child discipline and behavior problems...	4	3	2	1
d. information on child development.....	4	3	2	1
e. information on health and safety.....	4	3	2	1
f. helping me to fill vacancies.....	4	3	2	1
g. information on service agencies (food stamps, counseling, abuse questions, etc.).....	4	3	2	1
h. information about associations for day care providers.....	4	3	2	1
i. business advice, like fee collections....	4	3	2	1
j. a review of and helpful comment about my work.....	4	3	2	1
k. other, (please write in) _____				

22. What is the highest level of schooling you have completed? Please circle one number.

Less than Junior High	Junior High School			Vocational/ High School			Trade School/ College				Above 16
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	

23. Please note how many children you presently care for of each of the following racial groups.

	WRITE NUMBER OF CHILDREN
a. White	
b. Black	
c. Hispanic	
d. Oriental	
e. American Indian	
f. Other (please write in race)	

24. How often do you use EACH of the following reasons to set the fee per child? Please answer EACH item.

	Very Often	Occa-sionally	Seldom	Never
a. parents' or guardians' income	4	3	2	1
b. if child has special needs	4	3	2	1
c. bargaining with parents	4	3	2	1
d. child's family situation (family hardship, single parent, large family, etc.)	4	3	2	1
e. welfare workers' recommendation to parent for AFDC children	4	3	2	1
f. recommendation of district office	4	3	2	1
g. providing care for two or more children from one family	4	3	2	1
h. child's age	4	3	2	1
i. if the fee is set by the week versus by the day	4	3	2	1
j. number of hours child receives care	4	3	2	1
k. if the child brings lunch	4	3	2	1
l. other (please write in) _____				

25. What is your age? _____
WRITE AGE

26. What is your race? Please circle number under answer.

White	Black	Hispanic	Oriental	American Indian	Other (please write in)
1	2	3	4	5	_____

27. Please circle one answer which is closest to your total yearly family income before taxes.

a. Less than $5,000
b. $5,000 to $9,999
c. $10,000 to $14,999
d. $15,000 to $19,999
e. $20,000 to $24,999
f. more than $25,000

28. Where is your family day care home located? Please circle number under answer.

Rural	Urban	Suburban
1	2	3

29. Please circle any of the following which assist your personal living expenses. You may circle MORE THAN ONE.

a. AFDC
b. WIN
c. CAMAD
d. SSI
e. GA
f. None of the above